REMARKS

In the Office Action mailed November 23, 2007, the Examiner noted that claims 1-22 were pending and rejected claims 1-22. Examiner is respectfully requested to correct the Disposition of Claim in the Office Action Summary, noting that claims 1-4, 6 and 8-22 were and pending and were rejected. Claims 1-4, 6 and 8-21 have been amended, claim 22 has been canceled without prejudice, no new claim has been added; and, thus, in view of the foregoing claims 1-4, 6 and 8-21 remain pending for reconsideration which is requested. No new matter is believed to have been added. The Examiner's rejections are respectfully traversed below.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 101

In item 1 on page 7 of the Office Action, claims 1-4, 6 and 8-18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. It is submitted that claim 1, as amended, falls within one of the four statutory categories (e.g. machine). Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejections be withdrawn.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112

In item 2 on page 8 of the Office Action, claim 22 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. Claim 22 has been cancelled without prejudice and, therefore, the rejection is considered moot.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103

In item 3 on page 10 of the Office Action, claim 22 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Li et al. (USPN 6,631,496) (hereinafter "Li"). Claim 22 has been cancelled without prejudice, and, therefore, the rejection is considered moot.

In item 4 on page 11 of the Office Action, claim 1-4, 6, 8-21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Li in view of Chung et al. (USPN 6,012,090) (hereinafter "Chung").

Chung is related to a client-side parallel request for network services using group name association. Particularly, Chung et al. describes a retry access mode, which performs a periodic retry of those service identifiers for which a response is not received within a predetermined time period (see Chung et al., Abstract. Col. 7, lines 38-41).

Li is related to a system for personalizing, organizing and managing web information. The Office Action explicitly acknowledged that Li does not disclose

> if no input is supplied over a predetermined time period with respect to reference to any of the Web sites, said updating section tries to access each of the addresses contained in said address list, and deletes an address from said

address list if the number of times failure has occurred continuously becomes equal to a predetermined threshold value by failure of said tries

(see Office Action, pages 11-12) and relies upon Chung to disclose such features.

However, claim 1 has been amended to recite

if no input is supplied over a predetermined time period with respect to reference to any of the Web sites, said updating processor tries to access each of the addresses contained in said address list, and deletes an address from said address list if the number of times failure has occurred continuously becomes equal to a predetermined threshold value by failure of said tries **so as to delete an address of a relocated or extinguished Web site from said address list**.

(claim 1, lines 12-18, emphasis added), which is supported by the at least one of the embodiments of the invention on page 15, lines 9-17 of the application.

By at least the above-mentioned features of claim 1, an address from the address list is deleted if the number of times failure has occurred continuously becomes equal to a predetermined threshold value by failure of said ties. Thus, an address of a relocated or extinguished Website is deleted from the address list.

It is submitted that Chung does not teach or suggest the above-mentioned features recited in claim 1. Rather, Chung describes a retry mechanism to re-access a website for those service identifiers for which a response is not received within a predetermined time period. In contrast, claim 1 "delete[s] an address of a relocated or extinguished Web site from said address list" if the "number of times failure has occurred continuously becomes equal to a predetermined threshold value by failure of said tries".

Chung cannot teach or suggest at least the above-quoted features because the object of Chung is not directed to "delete an address of a relocated or extinguished Web site from said address list" rather the object of Chung is to resubmit the same request at a different time. According to Chung, a response may not be received for a number of reasons, such as network congestion, server overload, server failure (see Chung, col. 7, lines 41-45). Therefore, according to Chung, these problems can be bypassed by resubmitting the same request at a different because many of these problems are transient in nature (see Chung, col. 7, lines 45-52).

Accordingly, Chung is not concerned with "delet[ing] an address of a relocated or extinguished Web site from said address list" if the "number of times failure has occurred continuously becomes equal to a predetermined threshold value by failure of said tries", rather Chung is merely concerned dealing with transient problems, such as resubmitting the same request when a response is not received. As such, Chung does not teach or suggest the above-quoted features of claim 1 because, in light of the above, Chung teaches away from claim 1.

8

Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that claim 1 is patentable over Li and Chung, as neither reference, taken alone or in combination, teaches or suggests at least the above-mentioned features recited in claim 1.

Independent claim 19 recites

said updating includes trying to access each of the addresses contained in said address list, and deleting an address from said address list if the number of times failure has occurred continuously becomes equal to a predetermined threshold value by failure of said trying so as to delete an address of a relocated or extinguished Web site from said address list

(claim 19, lines 11-15). Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that claim 19 is patentable over the references, taken alone or in combination, for reasons similar to those discussed above with respect to claim 1.

Independent claim 20 recites

said updating includes trying to access each of the addresses contained in said address list, and deleting an address from said address list if the number of times failure has occurred continuously becomes equal to a predetermined threshold value by failure of said trial so as to delete an address of a relocated or extinguished Web site from said address list

(claim 20, lines 13-17). Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that claim 20 is patentable over the references, taken alone or in combination, for reasons similar to those discussed above with respect to claim 1.

Independent claim 21 recites

if no input is supplied over a predetermined time period with respect to reference to any of the Web sites, trying to access each of the addresses contained in said address list, and deleting an address from said address list if the number of times failure has occurred continuously becomes equal to a predetermined threshold value so as to delete an address of a relocated or extinguished Web site from said address list

(claim 21, lines 2-6). Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that claim 21 is patentable over the references, taken alone or in combination, for reasons similar to those discussed above with respect to claim 1.

Dependent claims 2-4, 6, 8-18 are patentable over Li and Chung, taken alone or in combination, for at least the same reasons as base claim 1.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejections be withdrawn.

Summary

In accordance with the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that all outstanding objections and rejections have been overcome and/or rendered moot. Further, all pending claims patentably distinguish over the prior art. There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: ___March 24, 2008___   By: _____

Sheetal S. Patel
Registration No. 59,326

1201 New York Ave, N.W., 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501